Application No. 10/667,369 Amendment dated November 17, 2005 Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2005

## REMARKS

Claims 12 and 18 are now present in this application.

The specification and claim 12 have been amended, and claims 1-11 and 13-17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasufuku et al., U.S. Patent 6,370,025. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Yasufuku et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 12 recites a heat-dissipating fin module. This module includes a conductive base, a plurality of first heat-dissipating fins, a plurality of second heat-dissipating fins, and at least one third heat-dissipating fin. For the first and second heat-dissipating fins, the curvature centers are on the same line. The outermost first heat-dissipating fin and second heat-dissipating fin are shorter and the third heat-dissipating fin is straight.

The Yasufuku et al. patent discloses an electronic module. In this module, there are various heat-dissipating fins. The third heat-dissipating fin would be a triangle fin, not a straight fin. Due to this difference, the present invention has more air flow in the middle of the module. In addition, the air pressure at the middle of the module is higher than at other areas. This will make the air flow out of the module more quickly than the Yasufuku et al. patent. The efficiency of heat-dissipation of the present application is better than that of Yasufuku et al. It is respectfully submitted that the patent to Yasufuku et al. would neither suggest nor render

Application No. 10/667,369 Amendment dated November 17, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2005

obvious independent claim 12 or dependent claim 18. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested

that the 35 USC 102(b) and 103 rejections now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show

the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments

concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is

invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies,

to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional

fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

6